

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, and 23-24 remain in the application. Claims 3, 10, 17, and 23 have been amended to re-write them in independent form, including all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. In addition, claim 10 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, to introduce the term APU in parenthesis to provide a definition of this term.

On page 2, paragraph 2 of the Official Action, claims 11 and 15-16 were objected to. In reply, claim 10 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the term APU as used in claim 11, and claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled.

On page 2, paragraph 4 of the Official Action, claims 12-13, 15, 19, 22, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sawada et al. (6,219,381). In response, these claims have been cancelled.

On page 5, paragraph 6 of the Official Action, claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Krause et al. (5,949,948). In response, these claims have been cancelled.

On page 6, paragraph 7 of the Official Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Krause et al. and Porter et al. (5,659,539). In response, claim 5 has been cancelled.

On page 7, paragraph 8 of the Official Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Krause et al. and Hamamoto et al. (5,953,486). In response, claim 8 has been cancelled.

On page 8, paragraph 9 of the Official Action, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Hamamoto et al. In response, claim 16 has been cancelled.

On page 8, paragraph 10 of the Official Action, claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. in view of Porter et al. In response, claims 20 and 21 have been cancelled.

On page 8, paragraph 11, claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, and 23-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claims 3, 10, 17, and 23 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 4 is dependent upon claim 3, claim 11 is dependent upon claim 10, claim 18 is dependent upon claim 17, and claim 24 is dependent upon claim 23. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, and 23-24 are now in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 09/608,919
Reply to Official Action

In view of the above, reconsideration is respectfully requested, and early allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Auchterlonie
Reg. No. 30,607
Attorney for Assignee
NOVAK DRUCE LLP
1615 L Street, NW, Suite 850
Washington, DC 20036
713-751-0655

Date: 30 July 2004